1	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CSBN 44332) United States Attorney	
2	BRIAN STRETCH (CABN 163973) Chief, Criminal Division	
4	DENISE MARIE BARTON (MABN 634052) Assistant United States Attorney 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-7359 Facsimile: (415) 436-7234 denise.barton@usdoj.gov	
6 7		
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
10		
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
13	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	CR No. 09-0033 WHA
15	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
16	v.)) EXCLUDING TIME FROM JANUÁRY 15, 2009 THROUGH FEBRUARY 3, 2009
17	JEFFREY DAVID SCHINKEL,	
18	Defendant.	
19		
20	On January 15, 2009, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that	
21	time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from January 15, 2009 through	
22	February 3, 2009. The parties represented that granting the continuance was	
23	necessary for continuity of counsel and for effective preparation of counsel to afford defense	
24	//	
25	//	
26	//	
27	//	
28	UNITED STATES V. SCHINKEL, CR No. 09-0033 WHA, STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING	TIME 1

Case 3:09-cr-00033-WHA Document 24 Filed 04/02/09 Page 2 of 2

1	counsel time to review discovery, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18	
2	U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).	
3 4	SO STIPULATED: JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO United States Attorney	
5 6 7	DATED: April 1, 2009 John States John S	
8 9 10 11	DATED: April 1, 2009 /s/ EDWIN PRATHER CRAIG BESSENGER Attorney for JEFFREY DAVID SCHINKEL	
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	As the Court found on January 15, 2009, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from January 15, 2009 through February 3, 2009 for continuity of counsel and effective preparation of counsel. See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny the defendant continuity of counsel and deny counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).	
21 22 23 24 25 26	DATED: 4/2/09 DATED: 4/2/09 HONORA United State Live D. Laporte Sudge Elizabeth	
28	UNITED STATES V. SCHINKEL, CR No. 09-0033 WHA, STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME	

2